



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,697	04/07/2001	Jahanshah Moreh	60468.300301	5064

32112 7590 02/17/2004

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW OFFICE
1901 S. BASCOM AVENUE, SUITE 660
CAMPBELL, CA 95008

EXAMINER

TRAN, PHILIP B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 02/17/2004

15

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/827,697

Applicant(s)

MOREH ET AL.

Examiner

Philip B Tran

Art Unit

2155

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 10 February 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' arguments are not persuasive (see attachment).
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: None.

Claim(s) objected to: None.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-42.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Baru teaches a method and system for authenticating a subject residing in a subject domain on a network to a server application residing in a server domain on the network, wherein an authentication mechanism residing in an authentication domain on the network affects the service provided by the server application comprising a client for communicating with other components of the system and for authenticating the subject to other components of the system by providing client credentials on behalf of the subject, wherein said client also resides in the subject domain. For example, client communicates with other components like SRB server for authentication [see Fig. 2 and Sec. 3 on Page 5]. In addition, Baru further teaches a protocol proxy for communicating between said client and the authentication mechanism and for authenticating said client based on said client credentials, for obtaining from the authentication mechanism temporary credentials for said client to access the server application, and for creating from said temporary credentials an authentication name assertion allowing said client to access the server application. For example, proxy operations for communication between client and SRB agent as authentication mechanism [see Secs. 2.8-2.10 on Page 4 and Sec. 3 on Page 5].

From the claim language point of view, there is no way triangle or "T" shaped rotated 90 degrees counter clockwise can be drawn to illustrate chronological step-by-step carried out for communication among components of client-server network as argued by applicants. Applicants' arguments are totally based on applicants' interpretation of specification and figure 1 of the instant application's disclosure. Limitations of claims (especially, independent claims) do not disclose the location of each components as shown in figure 1 of the instant application's disclosure and certainly do not show chronologically sequential step-by-step carried out for communication among components of client-server network with applicants' interpretation of invention in sequence as illustrated on Page 9 of After-final action (Paper 14).

Therefore, the examiner asserts that the cited prior arts teach or suggest the subject matter broadly recited in independent claims. Claims 2-22 and 24-42 are rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims and by other reasons set forth in Paper No. 13. Accordingly, rejections to claims 1-42 are respectfully maintained as shown in Paper No. 13.


HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER